

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject matter are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Benton et al.*, US Patent No. 5,706,455 (“Benton”). Claims 2-6, 9-14, 16-25, 27-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benton in further in view of *Joseph et al.*, US Patent No. 5,485,600 (“Joseph”). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benton in further view of Joseph and *Hotine*, US Patent No. 4,244,385 (“Hotine”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention would not have been anticipated by Benton or rendered obvious in view of Benton alone or in combination with Joseph and/or Hotine.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to “[a] display entity for use in presenting a visual depiction of a process entity of a process plant to a user on a display device.”

Amended independent claim 1 recites:

a computer readable memory; and,

a display object stored on the computer readable memory and adapted to be executed on a processor, the display object including:

a property memory adapted to store a value of a property associated with the process entity;

a graphic representation of the process entity adapted to be displayed to a user on a display device when the display object is executed on a processor;

a definition routine adapted to enable a user to define a routine that operates in conjunction with the visual representation of one of the graphic objects and the property during execution of the graphic display; and

a routine that operates in conjunction with the graphic representation of the process entity displayed to the user and that is associated with the value of the property.

The Examiner alleges that Benton discloses all of the features of claim 1. In particular, the Examiner points to Benton (col. 3, line 62 to col. 4, line 41) as allegedly disclosing definition routine adapted to enable a user to define a routine that operates in conjunction with the visual representation of one of the graphic objects and the property during execution of the graphic display.¹ However, there is no portion of Benton that teaches or suggests: “a definition routine adapted to enable a user to define a routine that operates in conjunction with the visual representation of one of the graphic objects and the property during execution of the graphic display,” as required by newly amended claim 1. Rather, Benton merely discloses an automated control system that controls and/or monitors physical devices within that system.² In fact, Benton fails to mention any kind of routine that defines a routine for operating in conjunction with visual representations of graphic objects and the property during execution of a graphic display.

Similarly, Joseph and Hotine do not teach or suggest this claimed feature which is missing from Benton.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-14, should be allowable because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine and modify the cited references to produce the claimed invention.

Independent claim 15 and newly amended independent claim 26 recite similar features to those discussed with regard to claim 1. In particular, claims 15 and 26 recite in

¹ This feature was recited first in claim 15 and has been added to claims 1 and 26 to further distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art and this feature is not disclosed in the cited prior art.

² See col. 3, line 63 to col. 4, line 20, discussing the automated control system and the devices that communicate within that system.

part: “a definition routine adapted to enable a user to define a routine that operates in conjunction with the visual representation of one of the graphic objects and the property during execution of the graphic display.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15 and 26 (and their respective dependent claims 16-25 and 27-37) are patentable for at least the reasons mentioned above for claim 1.

In view of the above amendment and arguments, the applicant submits the pending application is in condition for allowance and an early action so indicating is respectfully requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-2855, under Order No. 06005/41115 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Anthony T. Whittington/
Anthony T. Whittington
Registration No.: 54,871
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant